

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

PROBATION DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS

2008 SEP 29 P 1:51

DISTRICT COURT  
JUDGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

Joe Lewis Robinson, #289540,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	Civil Action No. 9:08-1448-HFF-BM
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Warden, Stevenson Correctional	)	<b>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</b>
Institution,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

---


The pro se Petitioner brought this action seeking relief pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 2254. On July 24, 2008, the Respondent filed a motion for summary judgment. By order of this Court filed July 28, 2008, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the Petitioner was advised of the dismissal and summary judgment procedures and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately.

However, notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions as set forth in the Court's Roseboro order, the Petitioner failed to respond to the motion. As the Petitioner is proceeding pro se, the court filed a second order on September 15, 2008, advising Petitioner that it appeared to the Court that he was not opposing the motion and wished to abandon this action, and giving the Petitioner an additional ten (10) days in which to file his response to the Respondent's motion for summary judgment. The Petitioner was specifically warned that if he failed to respond, this action would be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978), Rule 41(b) Fed.R.Civ.P.

*Handwritten initials: SJ*

Notwithstanding this second warning, the Petitioner still did not respond. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. See Davis, 558 F.2d at 70; Rule 41(b), Fed.R.Civ.P.; Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989), cert. denied sub nom, Ballard v. Volunteers of America, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990) [Magistrate Judge's prior explicit warning that a recommendation of dismissal would result from Petitioner failing to obey his order was proper grounds for the district court to dismiss suit when Petitioner did not comply despite warning].

The parties are referred to the Notice Page attached hereto.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bristow Marchant  
United States Magistrate Judge

Charleston, South Carolina

September 29, 2008

12

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
901 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).

18  
c3